



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to keep themselves from things offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication; also that the dominant Latin versions have a three- rather than a four-clause text, omitting "things strangled," but with the addition of the negative form of the Golden Rule, and at the end of all, "Ye shall do well being carried along by the Spirit." Both agree that, though both readings are very old, the three-clause text cannot be maintained in its entirety; the negative form of the Golden Rule and the reference to the Spirit cannot be original. Where Professors Sanday and Lake differ is as to the omission of "things strangled." Dr. Sanday is with the consensus of opinion in holding that this omission and the insertion of the Golden Rule was with the intent of changing a "food law" into a moral enactment. Lake's contention here is (1) that the evidence for the omission and insertion in question is not similar, since Tertullian, for example, makes the omission but not the insertion, and that the two readings are independent of each other; (2) that there is no historical evidence whatever that the circles which read the text with the omission had any objection to a food law. Sanday maintains that the reading with the Golden Rule is older than Tertullian and shows that his omission of it in his quotation of the decree was necessary to avoid making havoc of the rest of the quotation, and hence that Tertullian is a precarious foundation on which to build.

As to the antecedent probability as to whether the three-clause group (in the main, of moral precepts) or the four-clause group (of ceremonial observances) was the original apostolic decree, Sanday reviews the circumstances of the time and shows that the lively discussion as to "food law" was pertinent to the conditions of the time, question of foods being one of the burning and practical questions of the day. He explains the omission in the Western text, not (as Professor Lake has misunderstood him as holding) because they had any objections to a food law, but that, as the process went on and the old controversy receded into the distance, the points on which it turned became less intelligible, the special abstention from "things strangled" being a puzzle to the West where no such usage existed. Thus Sanday regards the Eastern readings as reflecting Eastern conditions, likewise the Western as reflecting conditions which obtain away from Palestine. He thus regards the Eastern as the genuine text and explains how he conceives the Western variation to have arisen by a combination process of accident and design. He regards the omission as easier to account for than the insertion, and thinks his theory forms a reasonable bridge of hypothesis between the events of first and second centuries.

"The New Church History" (Henry C. Vedder in the *History Teacher's Magazine*, IV [1913], 275-80).

The new spirit and points of view that have profoundly affected the study and interpretation of history and, by consequence, church history, are traced to (1) the work of Darwin, (2) that of Karl Marx leading to the economic interpretation of history, (3) the development of the new sciences of anthropology, comparative religion, psychology, sociology or the science of society, (4) the new development in philosophy known as pragmatism.

"La réforme en Normandie, et les débuts de la réforme à l'Université de Caen" (H. Prentout in *Revue Historique*, November-December, 1913).

An attempt to account for the early appearance and the strength of the movement for reform in Normandy. It began as a movement within the Catholic church, under

the influence, both personal and literary, of Lefèvre d'Etaples and Guillaume Briçonnet. The author's aim is first of all to establish the independence and priority of the Reformation movement in France, and then to show that, as respects Normandy, the movement was not predominantly political, or social, or economic, but religious and humanistic. The center of its leadership and influence was the University of Caen in which the majority of the faculty and students, between 1560 and 1568, was Protestant.

The men who led the opposition to the ancient Catholic order were De la Mare, friend of Lefèvre and Briçonnet, a humanist and rector of the University of Caen in 1506, and critic of the pride, luxury, and avarice of the Clergy; Clichtone, friend of Lefèvre and editor of his writings; Pierre des Prez, friend of De la Mare and Lefèvre, and professor in the University of Caen after 1514, and rector in 1521; Ludovico Canossa, bishop of Bayeux in 1516, a reformer, and friend of Erasmus; and David Jones, editor of the *Adagia* of Erasmus, rector of the University of Caen, and eulogist of Ludovico Canossa.

The author discovers the influence of Erasmus and the Netherlands upon the University of Caen, in its organization of a "College of the Three Languages" in imitation of Louvain. Charges of heresy were preferred against the University in 1531, in 1538-39, and again in 1544, each of which was successfully repelled. An attempt was made in 1564 to bring the university into a kind of affiliation with the Academy of Geneva. Great numbers of its students, after 1560, figure as Calvinistic pastors.

"Anent the Middle Ages" (G. L. Burr in the *American Historical Review*, XVIII [July, 1913], 710).

Professor Burr attempts to find a warrant for the Middle Ages as a period, in the sway over society exercised by the conception of the "state of God." According to this conception, given its classic form in Augustine's *State of God* (Mr. Burr emphasizes the value of "state" over "city" as a rendering of *civitas*), the state is in the church, not the church in the state; rulers of the state must put at the service of the church not only themselves but all their authority as sovereigns, all their means of persuasion and constraint. The final touch to this conception was put by Leo when, for treason to the Heavenly Emperor, that is, heresy, he assigned the penalty of death. Mr. Burr urges "that if our study of the Middle Ages began a little earlier, we might the better discern beneath all their administrative dualism that great underlying unity, that mediaeval Christendom which men call sometimes the Church Universal, the Commonwealth of Mankind, but oftenest the peregrine city of the State of God." From this point of view the Middle Ages would come to an end with the collapse of the conception of the State of God. This collapse he would date, not from Luther or from Calvin, both of whom were under the domination of the idea of the State of God, but from the protest that arose over an act, the burning of Servetus, prompted by this mediaeval conception of the State of God. In "multitudinous ways the great movements which were to secularize and free the age that followed may be traced to the protest, stirred by that reincarnation of the mediaeval State of God." Mr. Burr does not urge that we should end the Middle Ages here. He only maintains that, thus viewed, the Middle Ages have still some warrant as a period, and that periods in history, if to be intelligible, must overlap.